OPEN MEETING ITEM **OPEN MEETING**

ORIGINAL MEMPERSHIPEDM

Arizona Corporation Commission

JAN 2 5 2005

DOCKETED

410

7005 JAN 25 P 2: 22

TO:

THE COMMISSION

AZ CORP COMMISSION

FROM:

DATE:

Utilities Division

DOCUMENT CONTROL

January 25, 2005

DOCKETED BY

RE:

OF THE APPLICATION OF **AMERIVISION** IN THE MATTER COMMUNICATIONS, INC. TARIFF FILING TO CHANGE LEC BILLED

SURCHARGE RATE (DOCKET NO. T-03100A-04-0468)

On June 22, 2004, AmeriVision Communications, Inc. ("AmeriVision") filed tariff revisions to its Telecommunications Services Tariff and Price List. AmeriVision seeks to change its Local Exchange Carrier ("LEC") Billed Surcharge Rate. A LEC Billed Surcharge is a monthly surcharge customers pay to have AmeriVision's long distance charges reflected on their LEC's monthly billing statement. Currently, AmeriVision's long distance customers have the choice of being directly billed by AmeriVision, at no cost or being billed by the customer's LEC at a monthly charge of \$1.50. This filing seeks to increase AmeriVision's LEC Billed Surcharge Rate from \$1.50 to \$2.00. Because customers may pay more under AmeriVision's proposal, Arizona Corporation Commission ("ACC" or "Commission") Staff ("Staff") considers this filing a rate increase.

AmeriVision indicated that it is filing these tariff revisions to keep pace with the costs associated with offering customers the option of being billed for long distance on their local service bill. AmeriVision also indicated that it currently has Arizona customers served by the following three LECs: South Western Telephone, Qwest Corporation and Verizon. These LECs currently assess AmeriVision monthly charges ranging from \$1.77 to \$3.34 for each customer they bill on AmeriVision's behalf.

Staff has reviewed the approved maximum rates for AT&T Communications of the Mountain States ("AT&T") and Sprint Communications Services, Inc. ("Sprint") for the same service. Staff has determined that the Maximum Rate proposed by AmeriVision (\$2.00) is \$0.49 less than AT&T's approved Maximum Rate of \$2.49. Staff also determined the Maximum Rate proposed by AmeriVision (\$2.00) is \$0.50 more than Sprint's approved, Maximum Rate of \$1.50.

AmeriVision indicated that it currently charges for LEC billing in 48 states other than Arizona. In these 48 states, AmeriVision indicated that it charges the same rate it is requesting the authority to charge in Arizona (\$2.00).

Since this filing increases the maximum rates for a component of a service that has been classified as competitive under the Commission's Competitive Telecommunications Service Rules, Arizona Administrative Code ("A.A.C.") R14-2-1110 applies to AmeriVision's proposal. AmeriVision provided the information required by A.A.C. R14-2-1110 to allow Staff to determine the potential effects of approval of the filing. The information provided indicates that the expected revenue effect of approval of this filing is an increase of \$6,540 in AmeriVision's Arizona revenues. This expected revenue effect represents an extremely small percent of AmeriVision's Arizona revenues.

AmeriVision indicated that it currently charges for LEC billing to 1,090 customers in Arizona. Staff has reviewed AmeriVision's customer notification and believes that it is consistent with Commission rules.

The rates contained in this filing are for services that have been classified as competitive by the Commission and that are now subject to the Commission's Competitive Telecommunications Service Rules. Under these rules, rates for competitive services are not set according to rate of return regulation. Staff requested information from AmeriVision regarding its fair value rate base. AmeriVision indicated that its fair value rate base is zero. However, the rate to be ultimately charged by AmeriVision will be heavily influenced by the market. Because of the nature of the competitive market and other factors, a fair value analysis is not necessarily representative of the company's operations. Also, AmeriVision's proposed surcharges for LEC billing are comparable to the rates charged by other providers of the same service in Arizona. Therefore, while Staff considered the fair value rate base information submitted by AmeriVision, it did not accord that information substantial weight in its analysis of this matter.

Staff believes this tariff revision is reasonable, fair and equitable, and therefore in the public interest.

Staff recommends approval of this filing.

for Ernest J. Johnson

Director

Utilities Division

EGJ:AJL:rdp/JW

ORIGINATOR: Adam Lebrecht

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION 1 2 JEFF HATCH-MILLER Chairman 3 WILLIAM A. MUNDELL Commissioner 4 MARC SPITZER Commissioner 5 MIKE GLEASON Commissioner 6 KRISTIN K. MAYES Commissioner 7 DOCKET NO. T-03100A-04-0468 8 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION) OF AMERIVISION COMMUNICATIONS, 9 INC. TARIFF FILING TO CHANGE LEC DECISION NO. BILLED SURCHARGE RATE 10 **ORDER** 11 Open Meeting 12 February 8 and 9, 2005 Phoenix, Arizona 13 BY THE COMMISSION: 14 **FINDINGS OF FACT** 15 AmeriVision Communications, Inc. ("Amerivision") is certified to provide 1. 16 intrastate telecommunications service as a public service corporation in the State of Arizona. 17 On June 22, 2004, AmeriVision filed tariff revisions to its Telecommunications 18 2. Services Tariff and Price List: 19 Telecommunications Services Tariff 20 Tariff Section 4, Page 38.1, Release 2 21 22 AmeriVision seeks to change its Local Exchange Carrier ("LEC") Billed Surcharge 23 3. Rate. A LEC Billed Surcharge is a monthly surcharge customers pay to have AmeriVision's long 24 distance charges reflected on their LEC's monthly billing statement. Currently, AmeriVision's 25 long distance customers have the choice of being directly billed by AmeriVision, at no cost or 26

being billed by the customer's LEC at a monthly charge of \$1.50. This filing seeks to increase

AmeriVision's LEC Billed Surcharge Rate from \$1.50 to \$2.00. Because customers may pay

27

28

more under AmeriVision's proposal, Arizona Corporation Commission ("ACC" or "Commission")
Staff ("Staff") considers this filing a rate increase.

- 4. AmeriVision indicated that it is filing these tariff revisions to keep pace with the costs associated with offering customers the option of being billed for long distance on their local service bill.
- 5. Staff has reviewed the approved maximum rates for AT&T Communications of the Mountain States ("AT&T") and Sprint Communications Services, Inc. ("Sprint") for the same service. Staff has determined that the Maximum Rate proposed by AmeriVision (\$2.00) is \$0.49 less than AT&T's approved Maximum Rate of \$2.49. Staff also determined the Maximum Rate proposed by AmeriVision (\$2.00) is \$0.50 more than Sprint's approved, Maximum Rate of \$1.50.
- 6. AmeriVision indicated that it currently charges for LEC billing in 48 states other than Arizona. In these 48 states, AmeriVision indicated that it charges the same rate it is requesting the authority to charge in Arizona (\$2.00).
- 7. Since this filing increases the maximum rates for a component of a service that has been classified as competitive under the Commission's Competitive Telecommunications Service Rules, Arizona Administrative Code ("A.A.C.") R14-2-1110 applies to AmeriVision's proposal. AmeriVision provided the information required by A.A.C. R14-2-1110 to allow Staff to determine the potential effects of approval of the filing. The information provided indicates that the expected revenue effect of approval of this filing is an increase of \$6,540 in AmeriVision's Arizona revenues. This expected revenue effect represents an extremely small percent of AmeriVision's Arizona revenues.
- 8. AmeriVision indicated that it currently charges for LEC billing to 1,090 customers in Arizona. Staff has reviewed AmeriVision's customer notification and believes that it is consistent with Commission rules.
- 9. The rates contained in this filing are for services that have been classified as competitive by the Commission and that are now subject to the Commission's Competitive Telecommunications Service Rules. Under these rules, rates for competitive services are not set according to rate of return regulation. Staff requested information from AmeriVision regarding its

1 fair value rate base. AmeriVision indicated that its fair value rate base is zero. However, the rate to be ultimately charged by AmeriVision will be heavily influenced by the market. Because of the 2 nature of the competitive market and other factors, a fair value analysis is not necessarily 3 representative of the company's operations. Also, AmeriVision's proposed surcharges for LEC 4 5 billing are comparable to the rates charged by other providers of the same service in Arizona. 6 Therefore, while Staff considered the fair value rate base information submitted by AmeriVision, it did not accord that information substantial weight in its analysis of this matter. 7 8 10. Staff recommends approval of this filing.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- AmeriVision is a public service corporation within the meaning of Article XV, 1. Section 2, of the Arizona Constitution.
- 2. The Commission has jurisdiction over AmeriVision and over the subject matter of the Application.
- 3. The Commission, having reviewed the tariff pages (copies of which are contained in the Commission's tariff files) and Staff's Memorandum dated January 25, 2005, concludes the tariff is reasonable, fair and equitable, and therefore in the public interest.

18 19

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Decision No.	Decision No.	
--------------	--------------	--

1		<u>ORDER</u>		
2	IT IS THEREFORE ORDI	ERED that the tariff pag	es listed in Finding of F	act No. 2 are
3	approved.			
4	IT IS FURTHER ORDERE	D that this decision shall	become effective immedia	ately.
5				
6				
7	BY THE ORDER OF T	THE ARIZONA CORPO	ORATION COMMISSION	ON
8				
9			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
0	CHAIRMAN	COMMISSIONER	COM	MISSIONER
1				
2	COMMISSIONER	C	OMMISSIONER	
3	COMMISSIONER	C	OMMISSIONER	
4			EOF, I BRIAN C. McNE. zona Corporation Comm	
15		hereunto, set my hand	d and caused the officia	l seal of this
16		Phoenix, thisd	ffixed at the Capitol, in ay of	, 2005.
17				
18				
19		BRIAN C. McNEIL		
20		Executive Secretary		
21				
22	DISSENT:			
23 24	DISSENT:			
25	EGJ:AJL:rdp/JW	•		
16	••			
26 27				

28

Decision No.

Docket No. T-03100A-04-0468